

Chapter 6: Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. This chapter summarizes the results of UDOT's efforts to identify, address, and resolve project-related issues through early and continuing coordination. Agency consultation and public participation for this project have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods. Agency and public participation meetings are summarized in **Section 6.1** and other outreach methods are discussed in **Section 6.2**. All written comments received to date are available for review at the H.W. Lochner Office located at 310 East 4500 South, Suite 600, Salt Lake City, Utah.

6.1 AGENCY AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETINGS

The primary agency and public participation meetings held to date are summarized in the following sections. These meetings are outlined in **Table 6.1-1**.

TABLE 6.1-1: AGENCY AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETINGS

Date	Meeting Type
August 30, 2005	Agency Scoping Meeting
November 29, 2005	Public Scoping Meeting - Open House #1
March 21, 2006	Transportation & Infrastructure Stakeholder Workshop
August 15, 2006	Public Open House #2
May 1, 2007	Public Hearing

6.1.1 Agency Scoping Meeting

A request for scoping comments and invitation to participate in an agency scoping meeting was sent to Federal, State, and local agencies, and other interested parties in August 2005. Response letters are included in **Appendix A**. The agency scoping meeting was held on August 30, 2005 at the USACE office in Bountiful. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure that a full range of issues related to the proposed action were identified and addressed. A photo slideshow of the corridor was shown and traffic forecasts and studies were presented. Twenty people attended, representing 13 agencies and local entities. Comments pertained to wildlife resources, wetlands, future city plans, traffic flow, utilities, drainage, grade separation at UPRR, safety, mobility, capacity, and public transit routes.

6.1.2 Public Scoping Meeting - Open House #1

The public scoping meeting was advertised in the Davis County Clipper. A project information sheet was also mailed out to the project mailing list and posted to city websites and the project website. Approximately 80 people, consisting primarily of local residents and businesses, attended this meeting that was held on November 29, 2005 at the Woods Cross City Hall. The purpose of the public scoping meeting was to educate participants on the NEPA process and present them with the preliminary alternatives. Handouts included an information sheet and a comment form. Comments were solicited on the purpose and need for the project and eight alternative concepts. The comment form also asked for ratings on each alternative concept. The concept that included the grade separation over the UPRR tracks and a five lane corridor received the highest rating. A 100-foot ROW width and the meandered alignment were also ranked the highest, and a painted median was preferred. Comments received during the open house related to:

- Signal timing;
- Additional signals needed;
- Grade separation at the UPRR crossing;
- ROW impacts;
- Lighting; and
- Safety.

6.1.3 Transportation & Infrastructure Stakeholder Workshop

The project team held a stakeholder workshop on March 21, 2006 at the West Bountiful City office. Participants were invited to the workshop through a mailed postcard. Follow-up emails and phone calls were also made prior to the meeting. The purpose of the workshop was to coordinate future transportation and infrastructure plans for the area and understand how these plans may affect SR-68. The workshop focused on the most complex area of the project (500 South, east of 1100 West). Attendees included representatives from the project team, UDOT, UTA, WFRC, Legacy / I-15 North project team, West Bountiful, Woods Cross, UPRR, Rocky Mountain Power (formerly Utah Power & Light), Bountiful Power, Holly Refinery, South Davis Metro Fire, Johansen Thackeray, Cooper Roberts Simonson Associates, and a local citizen. Each attendee was asked to offer their vision for the corridor and provide current issues with SR-68. After the issues were identified, groups were created and participants brainstormed solutions and identified who should be responsible for implementing the solution. The issues and solutions are summarized in **Table 6.1-1**.

TABLE 6.1-2: ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS

CONGESTION		
Issue	Action	Responsible Party
Crossing Safety	Grade Separation, Traffic Signals, Pedestrian Overpass, Fencing	UDOT, Local Governments, Local Developers, UTA, UPRR
Safety & Security of Refinery	Close north leg of 800 West and 500 South to public	Holly Refinery, UDOT, West Bountiful
Safety of public driving through Refinery site	Close north leg of 800 West and 500 South to public	Holly Refinery, UDOT, West Bountiful
I-15 Interchange Congestion	Reconfigure for an interchange	UDOT, Local Government
Congestion at 700 West	Traffic Signal	UDOT, Local Government, UTA
Crashes at 800 West and 500 South	Overpass, Access Control, Signal, More Travel Lanes, Longer Turn Pockets	UDOT, Local Government
Vehicle Delay (East / West Traffic)	More Travel Lanes, Traffic Signals, Longer Turn Pockets, Grade Separation	UDOT, Local Government
ACCESS		
Issue	Action	Responsible Party
Access to Substation (future and existing)	Access off 500 South, Access through future development, Access off of 950 West	UP&L, Holly Refinery, TOD
Truck access to filling station	Rotate bays, Move station	Holly Energy, West Bountiful
Truck access to Refinery from south (if grade separation is chosen)	700 West bypass with railroad grade separation, Re-route trucks within Holly Refinery	Holly Refinery, West Bountiful
UTA station access off 500 South and 700 West	Relocate parking to the west of the railroad with a pedestrian overpass	TOD, UTA
GRADE SEPARATION AND GENERAL RAIL CONGESTION		
Issue	Action	Responsible Party
Overpass impacts to substation	Build substation at 850 to 950 West	UDOT, Rocky Mountain Power (formerly UP&L)
	Reconfigure access to Refinery	Holly Refinery, UDOT, West Bountiful
	700 West extension	UDOT, West Bountiful
	Purchase additional property to provide access to those without	UDOT, West Bountiful
	Access of substation through TOD	TOD, Woods Cross, Rocky Mountain Power (formerly UP&L)
	Relocate refinery filling station loading	Holly Refinery, West Bountiful, UDOT
	Signal at 800 West	UDOT, Woods Cross, West Bountiful

GRADE SEPARATION AND GENERAL RAIL CONGESTION (continued)		
Issue	Action	Responsible Party
Refinery truck access on 400 North if 800 West is closed	Coordination between Holly Refinery and West Bountiful	Holly Refinery, West Bountiful
New crossings / Train Capacity	Secure funding for grade separation, Phased Construction	Woods Cross, West Bountiful, UDOT
At grade crossing on 800 West for internal Holly Refinery rail switching	Close 800 West, trade at grade for 500 South, justify safety by moving switch off of 500 South	Holly Refinery, UPRR, UDOT, West Bountiful
800 WEST		
Issue	Action	Responsible Party
	Keep at grade intersection at 800 West with a signal located at both 800 West and 700 West	UDOT
North / South Access Between Woods Cross and West Bountiful	Grade separation over rail and grade separate 800 West to tie into 500 South	UDOT, Holly Refinery
	Realign 800 West to 700 West with grade separation	UDOT, Local Government
Note: The above table represents information based on the views of individuals participating in the workshop.		

Following this workshop, a letter of concurrence was signed by the cities of West Bountiful and Woods Cross (see letters dated May 12, 2006 in **Appendix A**) agreeing that the grade separation would not be included as part of this project. This project does not preclude grade separation from happening in the future, and the cities can continue to pursue a grade separated crossing as a separate project.

6.1.4 Public Open House #2

Public Open House #2 was advertised in the Davis County Clipper. A project information sheet was also mailed out to the project mailing list and posted to the project website. Approximately 40 people attended this meeting that was held at Woods Cross Elementary School on August 15, 2006. Members of the project team, UDOT, WFRC, UTA, and the Legacy Parkway Design Team were present to address questions. Representatives from the UDOT ROW Division were also available to answer specific ROW issues. Maps of the possible Build Alternative were on display for review. Boards illustrated the alternative development and screening process the project team used to arrive at the recommended Build Alternative, which included the 110-foot and 94-foot ROW typical sections. Handouts included a comment form and updated project information sheet. Nine comment forms were returned, and comments received pertained to:

- Access at the Wood Haven MHP entrance;
- Access and signals around 770 West;
- Grade separated crossing at the UPRR;
- The bottle neck at the I-15 underpass;
- Timeline of the project;
- Bike lanes;
- Signals at 700 West;
- Median options; and
- Eliminating the park strip.

6.1.5 Public Hearing

A Public Hearing was held on May 1, 2007 at Woods Cross Elementary School. Approximately 50 people attended the hearing. Notices were placed in the Salt Lake Tribune, Deseret News, and the Davis County Clipper. A postcard invitation was mailed to the project stakeholder list and a reminder e-mail was also sent. Local officials and individuals potentially displaced by the project were sent a personalized letter inviting them to participate in the hearing, as were individuals who received a copy of the draft EA. (See letters from H.W. Lochner dated April 5, 2007 and April 13, 2007, and letter from UDOT dated April 17, 2007 in **Appendix A**). The draft EA and public hearing notice was also posted to the project website. Members of the project team, as well as representatives from UDOT, WFRC, UTA, and the South Davis Transit Study were present to address questions. In addition presenting information and soliciting comments pertaining to the findings of the draft EA, comments were also solicited that would assist UDOT and cities develop the Access Management Plan for this corridor. Three draft EA comment forms and 37 Access Management comment forms were received.

6.2 OTHER OUTREACH METHODS

6.2.1 Stakeholder Interviews & Questionnaires

At the initiation of the project, approximately 30 interviews were conducted with residents and businesses along the corridor. Questionnaires were also distributed to residents and businesses (see letter dated September 30, 2005 in **Appendix A**) to request

personal data necessary for the community impact assessment, which is summarized in **Section 3.3**.

6.2.2 Neighborhood Meeting

SR-68 project team members met with the Homeowners Association Board for the Westwood MHP in September, 2005 to discuss the 500 South EA and solicit comments. In that meeting, the project team was invited to the homeowners' annual meeting on September 17, 2005. Prior to the homeowners' annual meeting, the Homeowners Association Board members distributed the SR-68 project information sheet and questionnaire to all the residents living in the MHP. At the annual meeting, the project team made a short presentation about the project, held a question and answer session with the residents, and collected the questionnaires.

6.2.3 Project Website

A project website was developed to provide information about the project. The project website can be accessed at www.udot.utah.gov/sr68-500south/. The website contains links to other area projects, the city websites for West Bountiful and Woods Cross, a map of the project area, an overview of the project and schedule, information given at open houses (such as boards, maps, etc.) and the public hearing, and a comment form that can be downloaded and mailed to the project team. The website also includes contact information for the public to reach the project team. The draft EA could also be viewed and downloaded through this website.

6.2.4 Media Coverage, News Articles, and Newsletters

Advertisements for each public open house were published in the Davis County Clipper. They were also announced in each of the information sheets sent to individuals on the project mailing list. An article written by the Davis County Clipper was published after the first open house. The public hearing was advertised in statewide and local newspapers. Media coverage followed the public hearing and included articles in the Davis County Clipper and on abc4.com.

6.2.5 Other Consultation

Consultation with agencies and other interested parties has been conducted throughout the NEPA process using letters, phone calls, and/or email discussions. Meetings have been held, as needed, with various stakeholders to coordinate other projects in the area

and to resolve issues or concerns. Agencies and other interested parties contacted about this project include:

Federal Agencies

- FHWA
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Federal Railroad Administration
- USDA, NRCS
- USFWS
- USACE
- EPA, Region VIII
- USDOJ

Native American Tribes

- Northwestern Band of Goshute Nation
- Ute Indian Tribe
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians

State Agencies

- GOPB
- Resource Development Coordination Committee
- WFRC
- UTA
- UPRR
- D&RGW
- Utah Energy Office

- UDNR
 - Division of Parks and Recreation
 - Division of Wildlife Resources
 - Division of Water Rights
 - DDW
- UDEQ
 - DSHW
 - DWQ
 - DAQ
 - Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
 - DERR

Other Interested Parties

- Legacy Parkway Design Team
- Bountiful City
- West Bountiful City
- Woods Cross
- Holly Energy Partners (Filling Station)
- Holly Refinery (Oil Refinery)
- Utah Auto Auction
- Other Businesses and Residents Along the Corridor
- Utility Companies
- Bicycle Advocacy Groups

Appendix A includes the primary written consultation received from federal and state agencies and local entities.

6.3 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED TO DATE

Comments have typically related to access and other property issues, historic resources, truck traffic, railroad operations, other projects such as Commuter Rail and Legacy Parkway, noise, air quality, litter, sidewalks, curb and gutter, pedestrian and bicycle use, lack of law enforcement, and construction concerns such as utility disruptions and mail delivery. Meeting minutes, correspondence, and other comments received to date are available for review at the H.W. Lochner Office located at 310 East 4500 South, Suite 600, Salt Lake City, Utah.

6.4 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

As applicable, each of the comments received has been considered in the development of the purpose and need for the project, development and evaluation of alternatives, and/or used in the environmental technical analysis. **Table 6.4-1** includes comments received on the draft EA and responses to each of these comments. This table also includes substantive comments received after the formal comment period ended. Written responses, follow-up discussions, or meetings have been held as necessary to resolve issues or concerns.

TABLE 6.4-1: DRAFT EA COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comment	Response
<p>April 11, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Regarding SR-68. Thank you for providing us with a copy of this EA. Although we unable to thoroughly review this document at this time, we note that you do not predict any change in the average daily traffic or vehicle miles traveled as a result of the proposed action. We do not see the justification for this prediction given the expansion of the corridor and improvement of LOS.</p> <p>Robin Coursen Ecosystems Protection and Remediation National Environmental Policy Act</p>	<p>May 15, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Robin:</p> <p>We appreciate your time in reviewing the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and providing comments regarding the document. We have reviewed your comments with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), who have asked us to provide the following in response to your comments.</p> <p>As reported in the EA document (Section 1.3.3 and Appendix B) traffic forecasts, which are based on currently approved future land use plans which indicate an increase in travel demand and traffic volumes along the SR-68 corridor from existing conditions to the future 2030 design year. Local land use planners have indicated that these plans would be implemented with or without the project. These traffic volumes between the build and no-build condition for SR-68 varied only slightly. This is because the land use was not modified, and there are no other significant alternative routes in the area for vehicles to travel on, so the demand is accommodated on SR-68. The traffic demand for the roadway is similar in both conditions, but the</p>

Comment	Response
	<p>operational conditions (speed, travel time, delay) are significantly improved in the build condition.</p> <p>The EA (Section 2.4 and Appendix B) indicates an increase in average delay at all intersections in the 2030 No-Build and TSM scenarios. Corridor travel time nearly doubles in the 2030 No-Build and TSM scenarios. Network delay increases by factors of 5 and 4 in the 2030 No-Build and TSM scenarios, respectively. Only in the 2030 Build scenario does: the average intersection delay return to acceptable LOS D or better conditions, travel time approach existing travel time, and network delay remain similar to existing network delay. The build action is needed to accommodate the future traffic at acceptable Levels of Service.</p> <p>Should you have any additional comments or need additional information, please let me know.</p>
<p>April 13, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>I have a question concerning the intersection of 950 West 500 South in Woods Cross. I've tried to understand UDOT map and it seems like with the median in the center that there will only be access to our industrial area heading East on 500 South and no way to go West from our area. Is that correct or will there be a full intersection at that location? If that is the case all the business traffic and construction equipment that needs to go West will be forced to go South out of our industrial area and through the residential area to the South.</p> <p>Mike Greene Greene's Inc.</p>	<p>April 14, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Mike:</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>The proposed action for the 500 South corridor in the environmental document is not recommending a median treatment for the center lane of the SR-68 corridor. The median treatments for the corridor will be determined by an access management agreement between Woods Cross City, West Bountiful City, and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). The corridor agreement has not been written to date but will be completed in the near future.</p> <p>You are welcome to attend the upcoming public hearing for the environmental assessment and provide your comments regarding the possible median treatments for the corridor. The details for the public hearing are below:</p> <p>SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Draft Environmental Assessment Public Hearing Tuesday, May 1, 2007 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Woods Cross Elementary School 745 West 1100 South Woods Cross, Utah</p> <p>Should you have any other questions regarding the environmental document, please feel free to contact me.</p>
<p>April 29, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>We do appreciate any information regarding Westwood Pud.</p> <p>We are certain that some of the modular homes in Westwood, will be affected by "right of way".</p>	<p>April 30, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Duane, Diana, and Ariel:</p> <p>Thank you for your comments regarding the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Environmental Assessment (EA). The draft EA is out for review and you can read the document on our website at:</p>

Comment	Response
<p>Which homes in this community will be taken? We are so close to 500 South, we understand that (even our next door neighbor) who is at 1264 and 1266 units at Mayors Circle will probably go.</p>	<p>www.udot.utah.gov/sr68-500south. There is also a list of office locations on the website where the document is available for review.</p>
<p>How will UDOT realign the road within the Westwood area?</p>	<p>The proposed action outlined in the EA does not show right-of-way impacts to any homeowners in the Westwood Mobile Home Community. The center line for the proposed roadway is shifted to the north to avoid impacts to these homes. With the shift of the centerline to the north, there will be an impact to the Rockin' E Country Store frontage property, but no major impacts are anticipated to their parking area. You are welcome to review our design figures illustrating the new right-of-way limits on our website in the draft EA.</p>
<p>Will 1268 Governors Way be in the "right of way"?</p>	<p>SR-68 is a roadway owned by UDOT. The streets within the Westwood Community are not state roads and no changes are planned for these streets. If you have any questions regarding the roadways within your community, please contact your city representatives. 1268 Governor's Way is not anticipated to have any right-of-way impacts as part of our project.</p>
<p>Thank you for your answer.</p>	<p>The access into and out of your community will be maintained as part of the EA. The Westwood community currently has two accesses onto 500 South and they will be maintained. There is a possibility that a median will be placed in front of the community in the center lane, however the median treatments and locations have not been determined and will be outlined in the Access Management Agreement between UDOT, Woods Cross, and West Bountiful. You will have an opportunity to comment on this document at a later date.</p>
<p>Also, "all residents" within this Westwood Pud have serious concerns as to entering and exiting this Westwood area. It is so difficult now.</p>	<p>A noise wall is not currently planned for your community. A noise study was completed and due to the number of accesses that need to be maintained through the project corridor, the walls were not shown to provide the needed noise reduction for construction of these walls. No other types of walls have been identified for your location along SR-68 at this time.</p>
<p>The new traffic from Foxoboro, other new developments, the trucks for Albertsons, Costco, Walmart, Lowes, and all other transport trucks makes it a vicious cycle for (our lives) safety, as we try to enter or exit this Westwood residential area.</p>	<p>A public hearing will be held regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment tomorrow, May 1, 2007. You are welcome to meet with project team members and provide comments on the project. The public hearing will be held from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Woods Cross Elementary School (745 West 1100 South). If you are unable to attend the public hearing and would like to provide comments, please do so by May 11, 2007. You can email them to this email address or send them by mail to: SR-68 Project Team 4500 South 310 East Suite 600, Salt Lake City, Utah 84107.</p>
<p>We need a good wall "barrier" for our protection. An accident, along the Westwood Pud stretch of 500 South would cause damage to homes and lives.</p>	<p>Should you have any other questions or comments about the SR-68 project, please feel free to contact me.</p>
<p>How will UDOT protect Westwood from the intense heavy traffic?</p>	
<p>Also, will any of Rockin E Country store parking be taken by UDOT for "right of way"?</p>	
<p>We are very concerned about waiting so long and taking a total "chance" to make a right or left turn from Westwood (as entering 500 South) to go east or west.</p>	
<p>We are also concerned as "road rage" is seriously existing, daily, as any resident in Westwood is trying to enter or exit our residential.</p>	
<p>Duane and Diana and Ariel</p>	

Comment	Response
<p>April 30, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>The widening of 500 South will help bring traffic easterly until it hits 800 West in West Bountiful. At that point, the problems begin as you must cross multiple rail lines, the commuter rail, and then the narrowness of the I-15 under pass. Lanes narrow down to two lanes and this will really slows down and impedes traffic flow. I spent 20 minutes waiting on Redwood road to get up 500 South and proceed north onto the I-15 freeway last week, this will only get worse as you widen 500 South. This has all ready become a bottle neck area plagued with many issues.</p> <p>Can you widen another lane under the I-15 under pass? Could you ramp up over the tracks and maintain improved traffic flow under the I-15 bridge? Rework the two stop lights allowing better flow with only one light? These are expensive issues to deal with, but please consider this input into your program.</p> <p>Kent Sulser EdFP Manager of Davis County Community & Economic Development</p>	<p>April 30, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Kent:</p> <p>Thank you for your comments regarding the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>The project limits for the environmental study end at the I-15 southbound ramps and do not extend under the I-15 interchange with 500 South. Your comments regarding the interchange and the signal timing under the bridge will be passed onto the appropriate personnel at UDOT for consideration.</p> <p>As part of our environmental study, many alternatives for 500 South were considered. An overpass at the railroad tracks was considered as a possible solution for the corridor, however, the impacts of the alternative including residential and businesses relocations and the number of accesses that would be closed, caused the project team remove the overpass alternative from consideration for the environmental study.</p> <p>The at-grade crossing meets the level of service outlined in the study's purpose and need statement and does not impact as many properties. The cities of Woods Cross and West Bountiful can locate funding if they wish to pursue the overpass option.</p> <p>Our project team is hosting a public hearing for the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Draft Environmental Assessment tomorrow, May 1, 2007. The public hearing will be held from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Woods Cross Elementary (745 West and 1100 South) in Woods Cross.</p> <p>You're welcome to meet with members of the project team and provide additional comments regarding the document. Please visit our website at: www.udot.utah.gov/sr68-500south to view the draft environmental document or find office locations where the document can be reviewed.</p> <p>Should you have any questions or comments regarding the SR-68 Environmental Assessment, please feel free to contact me.</p>
<p>April 30, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>The "routes" that the communities have planned are: the Legacy Parkway Trail; a north-south trail on the old D&RG railbed; and a trail meandering along the A-1 Canal. They are all trails and the first two will be useful for commuting for some people. However, there is no excuse for UDOT to not be fully accommodating cyclists on 500 South and Redwood Road. Lots of cyclists already use this route despite the fact that it's not very pleasant with the non-existent shoulders and heavy truck traffic. Imagine how many more would use it if it was actually comfortable? Someone from DBAAC should contact the UDOT project manager for this</p>	<p>May 11, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Steve and Travis:</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Environmental Assessment (EA) and taking the time to provide your comments. We also appreciate your awareness of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Checklists.</p> <p>One of the objectives, as outlined in the Purpose and Need in the EA, is to provide a safe and efficient facility with connections to nearby major transportation facilities (transit, freeways, highways, and trail systems).</p>

Comment	Response
<p>Environmental Assessment and ask whether any of the bicycle/pedestrian checklists have been filled out for the project. If they haven't been, then you need to ask if they plan on filling them out at some point, and if they don't, then you need to ask them "why not?". If Redwood Road and 500 South aren't designed appropriately for bicycles, then UDOT is effectively cutting off one of the best routes for people to actually get to the Legacy Parkway Trail from the more heavily populated areas east of this area. I've attached a copy of the bike/ped checklists that can be found on UDOT's website. If you look at the checklist for the Environmental phase, you will see a list of questions that the project manager is supposed to pick from if they plan to not accommodate bikes in a project. You will also see that none of these things applies to the roadway in question.</p> <p>I haven't dug into this EA document yet, but it seems like they are saying that there will be shoulders along the whole route. As long as parking isn't permitted, then this will probably be a good cycling facility.</p> <p>However, making the shoulders wide enough for bike lanes (and if they are following AASHTO shoulder width guidelines, they would be) and designating the road as such would be even better. This is exactly the type of project where we need to be vigilant with UDOT about making sure that they follow their bicycle/pedestrian checklist procedures.</p> <p>Travis Jensen</p>	<p>The location of the bike routes identified in the document reflect those shown in the Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) long range master plan and the cities of Woods Cross and West Bountiful master plans. We are aware of and utilize the checklist to review bicycle and pedestrian use on the corridor. We feel that the proposed improvements included in the EA have been developed to meet those needs.</p> <p>The proposed action in the EA has 12-foot shoulders, which exceed the AASHTO criteria for bike paths. However, there is an option for a 94-foot right-of-way between the highly constrained area between 800 West and 700 West where a 4-foot shoulders is proposed. This width meets the AASHTO minimum design standards and will provide room for bicyclists who wish to use the SR-68 corridor. Parking will be restricted in the area of the 4-foot shoulders and at intersections which would also accommodate bicyclists on the corridor.</p> <p>Should you have further comments or questions regarding the SR-68 Environmental Assessment, please feel free to contact me or HG Kunzler at (801) 262-8700 or by email at 500south@hwlochner.com.</p>
<p>May 1, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Will they be taking any of the Mobile Homes in Westwoods Mobile Home Park? Cannot attend meeting tonight and need to know if my Mobile Home is in Jeopardy that runs along 500 South.</p> <p>DEE CHAPMAN SENIOR TECHNICAL SPECIALIST</p>	<p>May 1, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>No relocations are planned for the Westwood Mobile Home Park. The proposed roadway centerline has been shifted to the north to avoid relocations of this property. You can review the design figures that are in the draft environmental assessment on the project website at: http://www.udot.utah.gov/sr68-500south/draft_ea.htm.</p> <p>If you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me.</p>
<p>May 1, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>My name is Steve Wasmund. I am co-chairman of the Davis County Bicycle Advocacy and Advisory Committee, and a daily cyclist (I commute by bicycle from Davis Co to SL Co).</p> <p>Unfortunately, I will not be able to make the public hearing in Woods Cross today, however, I would like to comment, or more specifically, inquire as to the accommodations being made for bicyclists and pedestrians. After briefly reviewing the Environmental Assessment it appears as though there will be shoulders and sidewalks along this route. I wanted to confirm that the bicycle/pedestrian checklists had been utilized during</p>	<p>May 11, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Steve and Travis:</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Environmental Assessment (EA) and taking the time to provide your comments. We also appreciate your awareness of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Checklists.</p> <p>One of the objectives, as outlined in the Purpose and Need in the EA, is to provide a safe and efficient facility with connections to nearby major transportation facilities (transit, freeways, highways, and trail systems).</p>

Comment	Response
<p>the planning of this project.</p> <p>Redwood Rd is a route heavily utilized by cyclists even in it's current condition. Many more cyclists would use it if it were known as a safe route. Having other bicycle routes along smaller residential streets in the area would be useful, but it is important that this project accommodate cyclists completely.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Steve Wasmund Bountiful, UT</p>	<p>The location of the bike routes identified in the document reflect those shown in the Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) long range master plan and the cities of Woods Cross and West Bountiful master plans. We are aware of and utilize the checklist to review bicycle and pedestrian use on the corridor. We feel that the proposed improvements included in the EA have been developed to meet those needs.</p> <p>The proposed action in the EA has 12-foot shoulders, which exceed the AASHTO criteria for bike paths. However, there is an option for a 94-foot right-of-way between the highly constrained area between 800 West and 700 West where a 4-foot shoulders is proposed. This width meets the AASHTO minimum design standards and will provide room for bicyclists who wish to use the SR-68 corridor. Parking will be restricted in the area of the 4-foot shoulders and at intersections which would also accommodate bicyclists on the corridor.</p> <p>Should you have further comments or questions regarding the SR-68 Environmental Assessment, please feel free to contact me or HG Kunzler at (801) 262-8700 or by email at 500south@hwlochner.com.</p>
<p>May 1, 2007 [comment forms]</p> <p>The following is a summary of comments made on comment forms at the Public Hearing.</p> <p>The proposed action best fits the existing and future needs of the corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree • Agree and Disagree • Agree <p>Disadvantages of 110' ROW between 800 West and 700 West:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Property. • Too much impact on my business and others surrounding mine. <p>Advantages of 94' ROW Option between 800 West and 700 West:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't impact us. • Possible continuation of business at present location. <p>General 110' ROW Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My business [Salt Lake Imports] will be ruined and the property worthless. <p>Recommendations / other concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's needed. The roadway is currently overtaxed and dangerous. It looks to be like a nice improvement. • Time and mess – with the Legacy, trucks traveling 500 South now I have to wash my cars daily. What's next??!! • Concerns about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Length of time to complete project. 	<p>Timing/Staging – Construction of the SR-68 project will not begin until the Legacy Parkway Project is complete. The anticipated completion is in Fall 2008. Construction phasing for the SR-68 project will be determined by UDOT and the contractor and will be based on construction activities taking place for the project. Funding will also determine the construction limits. Based on current funding, the first stage of construction would extend from 1100 West to I-15. Funding is currently being requested from 1100 West to Redwood Road.</p> <p>Signing and access during construction – As noted in Section 3.4.4, access to businesses will be maintained throughout construction. Construction plans will require the contractor to provide access to businesses and sign these accesses throughout construction.</p> <p>Dust impacts during construction – As noted in Section 3.6.3, during construction the contractor will be required to maintain a Fugitive Dust Control Plan in accordance with the Utah Fugitive Emissions Program Rule R307-205-5, effective December 1, 2006. Measures will be included in the plan to control and mitigate dust from construction.</p> <p>Impacts to Salt Lake Imports – As noted in Section 3.4.3, the document recognizes that additional businesses may experience impacts such as loss of parking or signage. The extent of these impacts, or damages, will be assessed by UDOT appraisers during the design and ROW property acquisition process (see Section 3.3.6). Salt Lake Imports is</p>

Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the road be removed and then work moved to another portion of the project or will work start and continue until completion in each section. Will uninterrupted access be guaranteed throughout the project. What measures will be taken to advertise businesses are open during construction? 4. Can contractor be required to mitigate dust impact. We paint cars [730 W 500 S] and cannot do so with excessive airborne dust – will I be compensated for continual \$\$\$ very expensive filter changes?? <p>The Project Team effectively communicated with residents and businesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree Strongly Disagree Agree <p>Recommendations regarding communication with Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HG was very cooperative and pleasant to deal with. I've seen absolutely no one and the designer obviously doesn't understand how our business runs. <p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like a map showing the proposed path from 1100 West to 800 West please. 	<p>listed as one of the properties most likely to experience these types of impacts.</p> <p>Information request - Map was provided as requested.</p>
<p>May 1, 2007 [summary of verbal comments from the Public Hearing Transcript]</p> <p>Mr. and Mrs. Smith expressed concerns about the crossing of the D&RGW and UPRR lines and subsequent traffic delays. They would like an overpass to resolve this issue. They noted that they were impacted when Redwood Road was widened the first time and are frustrated that they are being impacted again. Additionally, they suggest that the abandoned D&RGW ROW be used for the light rail system and also want to know about how traffic will be accommodated where Legacy and I-15 connect.</p> <p>Mr. and Ms. Taylor and Ms. Winegar have several concerns in regards to Westwood MHP. They requested raised curbs and turning lanes at the east and west entrances of the MHP to allow safe access, noting that decorative islands and trees would just create blind spots. They state that turns can not be safely made at 1100 West and request a light at that location. An overpass at 800 West was also suggested to eliminate traffic backing up on 500 South to Redwood Road. Other suggestions include putting a road running east and west behind the MHP that would connect with 1100 West; thereby allowing MHP traffic to access 500 South from a signalized 1100 West intersection.</p> <p>Mr. Barin expressed concerns about access in and out of his business (South Davis Mill and Cabinet located at 756 West 500 South). Train cars being unloaded at Holly Oil are causing long delays and is it difficult to get</p>	<p><u>Responses to comments from Mr. and Mrs. Smith:</u></p> <p>As explained in Section 2.3, the grade-separated crossing of the UPRR was not advanced because the at-grade crossing was able to address the purpose and need objectives identified in Section 1.4 with fewer impacts associated with property access, utilities, and relocations. Based on the traffic analysis conducted for this project (see Appendix B), the at-grade crossing will provide an acceptable LOS (LOS D) in the design year. A letter of concurrence was signed by representatives of both cities stating that they are in agreement with the overpass not being pursued as part of this project (see UDOT letters dated May 12, 2006 in Appendix A). However, the cities of Woods Cross and West Bountiful can continue to identify funds for the building of the overpass if they wish.</p> <p>Comments regarding the light rail system in the Davis County area have been forwarded to the South Davis Transit Study team. For more information regarding this project is available on the project website at www.udot.utah.gov/southdavisransit or by calling the project hotline at (888) 721-4211. Information regarding the Legacy Project is available by contacting the Legacy Project Team toll-free at (877) 808-2008 or by visiting the project website at www.udot.utah.gov/legacy.</p> <p><u>Responses to comments from Mr. and Ms. Taylor and Ms. Winegar:</u></p>

Comment	Response
<p>out of his business. He is also having problems getting semis into his property, turning them around, taking them back out, and letting them go east. Any impacts to his property will make that difficult situation worse. He would like a decision made so that he can decide what to do with his business. He also noted that once emergency equipment gets through the narrow road, traffic is a mess after.</p>	<p>Median types and locations will be determined by the SR-68 Access Management Plan that will be developed as a joint agreement between UDOT and the cities of West Bountiful and Woods Cross. These types of comments will be taken into consideration as part of that process.</p> <p>In order for a signal to be installed, the intersection must meet a series of criteria. As part of the design process, UDOT will determine if a signal is warranted at this location.</p> <p>Please refer to the responses to Mr. and Mrs. Smith for information regarding the railroad crossings.</p> <p>A new city street running east and west along the south property lines of the Westwood is beyond the scope of this project.</p> <p><u>Responses to comments from Mr. Barin:</u></p> <p>The project team has been coordinating with Holly Oil representatives and is aware of their future expansion plans. These plans were considered in the future traffic analysis. Increasing the traffic lanes to two in each direction will increase traffic storage capacity and help reduce the .</p> <p>South Davis Mill and Cabinet has been added to the businesses listed in Section 3.4.3 that may experience impacts. The extent of these impacts, or damages, will be assessed by UDOT appraisers during the design and ROW property acquisition process (also see Section 3.3.6).</p> <p>Emergency response teams have involved in the project and participated in the workshop held March 21, 2006 to discuss the alternatives that have been evaluated for the project.</p>
<p>May 2, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>This has been needed for a long time.</p> <p>Thomas A. Smith, PE Davis County Public Works Director</p>	<p>No response necessary.</p>
<p>May 3, 2007 [letter]</p> <p>The Holly Refinery is located to the north of the SR-68 corridor between 800 West and 1100 West, and would like to offer the following comments to the draft EA:</p> <p>Table 3.15-1 lists hazardous materials or waste sites of potential concern. The number 1 item on this list is the "Bountiful-Woods Cross 500 South PCE Plume", which is a superfund site. This same description then says "(aka Phillips 66 Refinery aka Holly Refinery)". This superfund site has no relation to the refinery; please remove all references to both refineries. If you would like to confirm this, please contact Mario Robles at the EPA at 800-227-8917.</p> <p>Page 3-63 of Chapter 3 states that there are 3 separate</p>	<p>May 24, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Below are the responses to your letter sent to the project team on May 3, 2007. Also find a .pdf file of the EA document with the changes highlighted in gray regarding the Holly Refinery. The second figure is a draft of Figure 3-13 with the changes marked on it that will be reflected in the document.</p> <p>Reference to Phillips 66 and Holly Refinery has been removed from the 500 South PCE Plume. Based on consultation with EPA, two separate plumes have been identified to date as contributing sources. The Bountiful Family Cleaners is believed to have been a source since 1967 or earlier. A second source was the former Hatcho property located near 700 South 800 West in West Bountiful. A portion of the Hatcho</p>

Comment	Response
<p>plumes responsible for the 500 South PCE plume. The study further states that one of these 3 sources is the former Hatchco property, presently the Phillips 66 Refinery. While the former Hatchco property is one of the sources, they have no relation to the refinery; please remove all references to the refinery.</p> <p>There are a few more references to the "Phillips 66 Refinery" throughout this study; Holly Refining & Marketing Company has been the operator of the Phillips refinery since June 2003; please correct all such references.</p> <p>Based on the proposed roadway boundaries shown in figures 2-5 (sheet 10) and 2-6, there appear to be conflicts with our existing product lines at the northwest corner and northeast corner of 800 West and 500 South. While it is much more obvious in the 110' scenario, it also appears to be a conflict in the 94' version. Moving these lines and junction box would require significant expense, so it is our recommendation that the roadway be realigned to the south to avoid these possible conflicts.</p> <p>David Jelmini Health, Environmental & Safety Manager Holly Refining & Marketing Company - Woods Cross</p>	<p>property was later sold to JB Kelley. Additionally, EPA has better defined the extent of this plume, which is roughly bounded by 750 South to 200 North and 500 West to 950 West in the cities of Bountiful, West Bountiful, and Woods Cross.</p> <p>A site has been added to represent a separate MTBE plume. The MTBE Plume is suspected to have originated from the former Phillips 66 Company refinery. This plume has intermingled with the 500 South PCE Plume in the area of 500 South 800 West. The Utah DEQ is working with the present property owner, Holly Refining and Marketing, to remediate this plume which has migrated to the west by northwest across 500 South.</p> <p>References to Phillips 66 Refinery have been corrected, as applicable.</p> <p>Although it is desirable to avoid these lines and the junction box at the north side of the 500 South and 800 West intersection, the conceptual layout of the 110' and 94' options do show a conflict. This layout reflects the standard roadway offset to the switch operation that was installed on the Commuter Rail line near the crossing of 500 South and the railroad tracks. The project team is working with UTA to provide an acceptable offset to the switch, and still allow the roadway alignment to avoid impacting these lines. Further details will be developed during design in coordination with Holly, UTA, and UPRR to try and avoid these features.</p> <p>Should you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me or HG Kunzler at (801) 262-8700 or by email at 500south@hwlochner.com.</p>
<p>May 3, 2007 [letter]</p> <p>See letter from RDCC dated May 3, 2007 in Appendix A.</p>	<p>Section 3.6.3 has been changed to reflect the correct rule (R307-205-5). R307-309-4 does not apply to this area. If an asphalt or concrete batch plant is required, an Approval Order will be obtained from the DAQ.</p>
<p>May 4, 2007</p> <p>I work out of town, and wasn't able to attend the meeting. Is there any way I can receive the highlights of the Draft Environment Document by email? Specifically proposed changes between Redwood Road east to I-15.</p> <p>Thank you for any help you can give me!</p> <p>Pamela M. Johnson</p>	<p>May 22, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Pam:</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Environmental Assessment. I apologize for the late response, but I did want to pass on the link to the environmental document online.</p> <p>You can find the draft environmental document online at www.udot.utah.gov/sr68-500south/. If you have any questions regarding the document, please feel free to contact me.</p> <p>Again, I apologize for the late response.</p>
<p>May 14, 2007 [followup e-mail]</p> <p>Thanks for the response. It sounds like the facility will have some good shoulders for cycling purposes. I was wondering if you could clarify one thing from your email</p>	<p>May 17, 2007 [follow-up response]</p> <p>Travis:</p> <p>The 12-foot paved shoulders meet the preferred width for shoulders where on-street parking is allowed. The</p>

Comment	Response
<p>for me. One sentence says " The proposed action in the EA has 12-foot shoulders, which exceed the AASHTO criteria for bike paths". Are you referring to the AASHTO criteria for shared-use paths (which is 10-foot minimum, but isn't applicable in this case because Redwood Road would be an on-street facility, not a shared-use path) or the criteria about the amount of on-street shoulder space needed in order to have parking and a designated bike lane safely coexist (this standard is a minimum 11 ft, with 12-13 feet desirable).</p> <p>In either case, it sounds like good shoulder space for cycling -- I just want to understand which criteria you are referencing.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Travis [Jensen]</p>	<p>SR-68 corridor will have 12-foot shoulders and our understanding as we have developed the document is Woods Cross and West Bountiful will not allow parking along the roadway. The 12-foot shoulder will provide room for cars to pull off the roadway in cases of emergency or mechanical difficulties and still allow room for bicycles as outlined in the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. In the area between 700 West and 800 West, there is the option for 4-foot shoulders (no parking will be allowed in this area) which meets the minimum guidelines found in the AASHTO Bicycle Guide for paved shoulders.</p> <p>The corridor will not be a signed shared use facility as there is not continuity provided east of I-15 on 500 South at the I-15 interchange. For this reason, other routes have been identified as bike routes that have better continuity across I-15.</p> <p>Should you have further questions, please feel free to contact me.</p>
<p>May 16, 2007 [followup e-mail]</p> <p>As discussed today, I talked to Karl Miller from Baker Engineering about my comments, particularly the mis-statements he made about the association of the Phillips 66 and Holly refinery to the 500 South PCE superfund site. I was not able to convince him that the refinery should be removed from all such references. Attached are some documents that may help explain the issue better. I would appreciate any help you can offer. I also discussed this with Mario Robles at EPA and said he would try to call Mr. Miller as well.</p> <p>David Jelmini Health, Environmental & Safety Manager Holly Refining & Marketing Company - Woods Cross</p>	<p>Further clarification was obtained in phone conversations with Holly (Jelmini, May 16, 2007) and EPA (Robles, May 17, 2007). The e-mail response dated May 24, 2007 to Holly's original comment (dated May 3, 2007) addresses these concerns.</p>
<p>May 18, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>This entire corridor should be a bike route as listed on the WFRC. Even so, why can't the rest of the corridor be signed as a bike route, or even put in bike lanes in the 12' section if there is 13' or more available? The area east of I-15 on 500 S is a very small section, the rest is a key corridor in the area with few options North/South and through future development may be accommodated better. It can still be a bike route without the preferred shoulder or lanes.</p> <p>The UDOT Checklists mandate that ALL projects be considered. As this project is currently in the early stages, it appears to fall under the requirement for the Bike & Ped checklist. As a checklist should be filled out regardless of other "available" routes, could you provide me with a copy of the completed checklist (consider this an records access request). There is a place on the checklists I believe to note the existing routes, distance from the project and other relevant data such as the WFRC and master plans.</p>	<p>May 30, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>Dan:</p> <p>The SR-68 project team recognizes that bicyclists currently use the corridor and will continue to do so after construction is completed. As stated in the AASHTO Bicycle Guidelines, a 4-foot paved shoulder meets the minimum width for a bike route. This minimum width is provided in the recommended alternative outlined in the document. The SR-68, 2600 South to I-15 in Davis County Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) was written based on the 2004-2030 Wasatch Front Urban Long Range Transportation Plan (LRP). In this plan, 500 South was not designated as a signed shared roadway.</p> <p>Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) has developed their new LRP (2007-2030) and it was approved on Thursday, May 24, 2007. In that document, 500 South is classified as a Class II bicycle facility which the project team understands to be a signed and striped bicycle route.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>500 S Shows as a proposed class II route from Legacy to Main Street on the WFRC. I agree with Travis, the 12' reference is for Class I separated pathways.</p> <p>Also attached is from the San Francisco Bike Plan, and consolidates many common/best practice standards currently used</p> <p>Dan Fazzini Jr., Chair, Salt Lake County Bicycle Advisory Committee</p> <p>Director & League Cycling Instructor SafeRoute Connection, Inc.</p>	<p>After conversations with city representatives from Woods Cross and West Bountiful, the 2007 LRP does not reflect their wishes on the bike route location. They believe that 1500 South should be the designated bike route through the communities because of lower traffic volumes and the connectivity under I-15. However, as stated in the draft EA for SR-68, the preferred alternative will follow recommendations found in the approved WFRC LRP.</p> <p>We appreciate your understanding of the UDOT design process, especially the Bicycle and Pedestrian Considerations checklist. The items outlined in the checklist have been used as guidance during the development of the project's needs and alternative analysis. In this case, the checklist was not filled out but each item outlined in the checklist has been addressed in the document. You can reference the Draft EA on the project website at: www.udot.utah.gov/sr68-500south. Technical memorandums developed for the project are also available for your review on the website.</p> <p>Should you have further questions or comments, please feel free to contact us at (801) 262-8700 to discuss the project.</p>
<p>May 18, 2007 [e-mail]</p> <p>I agree with Dan, this route needs to be included in the reconstruction and widening of the 500 South project. It is on the WFRC 2030 RTP Bicycle Map as a class 2 bicycle route. These bicycle lanes will be a key component in tying the UTA FrontRunner Station on 500 South with both the Legacy Parkway Pathway and Redwood Road along with eventually</p> <p>tying in the communities on the east side of I-15 (the WFRC 2030 RTP includes a 500 South Interchange upgrade, along with I-15 widening, hopefully the interchange will be upgraded to accommodate bicycle traffic across I-15).</p> <p>UDOT's Roadway Design Manual For Instruction can be found at http://www.udot.utah.gov/main/f?p=100:pg:8382325097121921606:::T,V:1498, and then by clicking on the .pdf link. Section 9.2 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities (pages 207-241) includes what Dan is referring to as UDOT's checklists.</p> <p>Please contact me if any more information is needed.</p> <p>Jory Johner Wasatch Front Regional Council</p>	<p>Copied on response to Dan Fazzini (e-mail dated May 30, 2007).</p>

This page is intentionally blank.